Remarks/Arguments:

Applicant's Attorney thanks Examiner McCommas and his supervisor for the telephone interview on July 27, 2009. During the interview, it was agreed that if claim 11 were amended to include language from the specification it would appear to overcome the rejection based on the Huang reference.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 11-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang (USPN 6,268,840). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection. In particular, Huang does not disclose or suggest a controller that,

> controls the common and segment driver in such a way that each of the reset, select, hold, non-select, ON and OFF voltage waveforms has the same number of unit intervals the reset, select, hold, non-select voltage waveforms have two levels of voltages for all of the common electrodes and all periods of time, and the ON and OFF voltage waveforms have not more than two levels of voltages for all of the segment electrodes in the same unit interval.

as required by claim 11.

This feature of the subject invention, as defined by claim 11, is illustrated in Figs. 7A through 8C, which are described in the specification in paragraph [0036]. As shown in Fig. 8A, the signal applied to the common electrodes has two levels for all periods of time. As shown in fig. 7A, and as described in the specification at paragraph [0036] exemplary values for these voltages are 0V and 40V.

This limitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by Huang. As shown in Figs. 4A through 4F, at any given time, some of the row electrodes (corresponding to the common electrodes of the subject invention) of the display are in each preparation, selection, evolution and holding stage at any time. As shown in Figs. 6A through 6D, the signals applied to the row electrodes in corresponding unit intervals may have as many as four different values. In Figs. 6A, 6B, 6C and 6D, respectively, in the first unit interval, V_{P1}(0v) is applied to the row electrodes that are in the preparation stage, V_{S1}(40v) is applied to the row electrodes in the selection stage, V_{E1}(24V) is applied to the row electrodes in the evolution stage and V_{N1}(55V) is applied to the row electrodes in the holding stage. Thus, Huang does not disclose or suggest a controller that "controls the common ... driver in such a way that ... the reset, select, hold, non-

select voltage waveforms have two levels of voltages for all of the common electrodes and all periods of time."

Claims 12-24 depend from claim 11 and, thus, are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Huang for at least the same reasons as claim 11. Furthermore, with regard to claim 24, Huang does not disclose or suggest that "the voltages applied to the common and segment electrodes are 42 volts or less." As shown in Figs. 6A through 6D. the voltages applied to the column (segment) electrodes and row (common) electrodes are as much as 60 volts. Accordingly, claim 24 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for reasons independent of claim 11.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Huang and Yang et al. (USPN 6,154,190, "Yang"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. In particular, neither Huang, Yang nor their combination disclose or suggest that, "the common electrode drive voltage waveforms have two levels of voltages for all of the common electrodes and all periods of time," as required by claim 1. As set forth above, this feature of the invention is disclosed in Fig. 7A and described in the specification in paragraph [0036].

As described above, Huang does not disclose this limitation of claim 1. Yang discloses at column 12, lines 33-52 and in Figs. 5 and 6 that the row voltage, which corresponds to the common voltage of claim 1 has at least three different levels, 50 volts in period 1, 19 volts in period 2 and 30 volts in period 3. Thus, Yang can not provide the material that is missing from Huang. Consequently, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Huang and Yang. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Huang and Yang for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicant

KNN/ems

Dated: September 2, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

E_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\ESCHMITTINGER\548767_1.DOC